BOSTON UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES

Mugar Memorial Library

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF MUSIC

Thesis

MUSIC TEACHERS' TRAINING FROM 1931 TO 1941 WITH PARTICULAR EMPHASIS UPON THE COMPARATIVE EDUCATION OF INSTRUMENTAL AND VOCAL MUSIC TEACHERS.

by

Virginia E. Withey

(A.B. Mt. Holyoke - 1937 Mus. B. Boston University - 1940)

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master
of Music Education

1947

MMEd
1947
With
c.1

Approved by

First reader Kenneth G. Kelley
Professor of music Education

Second reader Keith D Snyder
Asst. Professor of Music Education

CONTENTS

Pages

1. Statement of the problem - - - - - - - 1

2. Minimum standards in 1931 and 1941 set by the states - - - - - - 8

   Table I. State specific music hours in 1941 - - - - - - - - 9
   Table II. State certification requirements 1931-1941 - - - - 11

3. Actual practice in the training of music teachers in 1931 and 1941 - - 12

   Table I. Graduation requirements - - 15
   II. Liberal arts requirements- - 18
   III. Education requirements - - - 21
   IV. Music methods requirements - 23
   V. Practice teaching requirements - - - - - - - - - - - 26
   VI. Musicianship requirements- - 29
   VII. Form and analysis requirements - - - - - - - - - - - 30
   VIII. Counterpoint requirements- - 32
   IX. Sightsinging and eartraining requirements- - - - - 33
   X. Harmony requirements - - - - 35
   XI. Music history requirements - 37
   XII. Conducting requirements - - 38
   XIII. Orchestration requirements - 39
   XIV. Applied music requirements - 42
   XV. Applied music (without class instruction) requirements- 44
   XVI. Ensemble requirements - - - 48
   XVII. Entrance requirements - - - 49

4. Statement by educators of the ideals in music teachers' training for the years 1931 and 1941 - - - - - - 54

5. Findings and conclusions - - - - - - - 70

6. Abstract of the thesis - - - - - - - - 81

7. Appendix - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 92

8. Bibliography - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 97

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem and Procedure

During the year 1932, Osbourne McConathy, in an article published by The Music Supervisors Journal, stated that the influx into the schools of trained band men knowing nothing of scientific pedagogy demonstrated that the pupils flock to teachers who can produce actual music results. He continued by saying that the later better type of choral organization showed that the vocal teacher learned from the instrumental teacher, and emphasized the fact that the music teacher of the future must be a good musician.[1]

The problem then arises. Did the new type of instrumental teacher, whose work gained such popularity with the school pupils, actually affect the training program of the vocal and general music supervisor? And how far did the traditional training of music teachers influence the education of the later instrumental teacher? Did any noticeable change occur in the music teachers' training program due to this or any other influence? Undoubtedly the success of the new type of instrumental teacher would at least provoke interest in the general

---

1. McConathy, The Next Twenty-five Years, in the Music Supervisors Journal, Oct. 1932, p. 17.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Boston Library Consortium Member Libraries

https://archive.org/details/musicteacherstra00with

training of music teachers, and it would be surprising if schools over a period of years held rigidly to the same course with the same proportion of subjects within it.

If one goes back into the history of public school music, it becomes apparent that the inclusion of music in the schools was established because Lowell Mason could prove through his teaching that practically all children could sing. Then, as this practice was adopted in more and more schools, the need for music teachers resulted in the founding of normal institutes for the purpose of training such people. Later, as the musical standards in America improved, some of the institutes became conservatories, and the teacher training standards were raised. From the year 1885 emphasis was placed on methods in the teacher's preparation. In the twentieth century the striking characteristic of public school music was its many-sidedness: the formation of more symphony orchestras stressed the listening aspect of music (appreciation methods); members of these orchestras serving in a dual capacity as players and private teachers also developed interest in instrumental music which in turn led to the organization of instrumental groups in the schools and the inclusion of part-time instrumental teachers as instructors, since the general music teacher knew little about instruments.[1] As early as 1915 had appeared an outline of instrumental instruction as it is today.

---

[1] Birge, History of Public School Music. Chap. 1 - 7.

This instruction demanded a new type of music teacher.[1] Although there was a time when the music teacher was looked upon with contempt by professional musicians, he now compels more respect from musical circles.

It is apparent that music education has been in a state of flexibility in adjusting itself to changing musical conditions in this country and it naturally must be assumed that, in consequence, the music teachers' training program has been far from rigid. This study, therefore, begins in 1931 to allow time for the instrumental program to have become somewhat stabilized and to have proven itself something more than a fad. By 1931 the instrumental program had been accepted, and definite training for such work was established, so that, from then on, successes in that field might influence the education of the vocal supervisor, whose training in turn might affect the preparation of the instrumental course. It is clear that the acclaim accorded instrumental groups such as bands and orchestras necessitated organization of superior choral groups by vocal teachers to continue the interest of students in vocal music. Thus, in the actual field of public school music, instrumental music indirectly raised the standards of vocal music. The question is - did the instrumentalists have any effect

---

1. Normann, Instrumental Music in the Public Schools, Chapter 1.

on the training program of music teachers? The period for the study of this paper, beginning in 1931, continues only through 1941 - for ten years - since with the year 1942 war time measures might have made temporary changes which have no bearing on the problem.

In order to formulate the picture of the training of instrumental and vocal teachers in 1931 and 1941, the following procedure was used: All state boards were asked to send their 1931 and 1941 certification laws for public school music teachers and for private music teachers, the latter because many part-time instrumental teachers of the schools were private music teachers certified by the state for public school teaching. Forty-one states plus the District of Columbia replied for 1941; seventeen for 1931. A comparison of the state certification laws of 1931 and 1941 revealed the minimum standards of this period.

For information as to the actual practice in the teachers' training school in the two specified years, a request for the catalogues of 1931 and 1941 was sent to different colleges from thirty-nine states. Since neither the Music Educators National Conference or any other organization could submit any list of music schools for this purpose, the colleges represented in Miss McEachern's doctor's thesis for Columbia University were used.[1] Her list was

---

[1] McEachern, A Survey and Evaluation of School Music Teachers in the United States.

obtained through the state chairmen of the Music Educators National Conference and the state departments of education who named the colleges with school music in their state, with the additional assistance of city music supervisors who mentioned colleges from which their best music teachers came. To these one hundred fifty schools went requests for catalogues for the years 1931 and 1941. In reply were received eighty-five answers, some of which were course outlines only; others, music courses only; still others, entire catalogues. Forty-nine schools sent helpful material for 1931; fifty-four, material for 1941; ten sent a 1942 course stating that no changes had been effected between 1941 and 1942; eight mailed incomplete data on the subject.

Catalogues were analyzed by courses - according to the number of hours for each subject or each field of study (all term and quarter hours were transferred into equivalent semester hours so that comparisons could be made easily); then colleges were accordingly grouped under a classified number of hours for each course in both years. This study showed the relative importance attached to that subject or field in the two respective years. By comparing the results of the two years, the relative emphases could be determined in the training of instrumental, vocal, and general music teachers; through this means also, the trends

in music education from 1931 to 1941 appeared. In addition, the same school was compared in the two years, which revealed an increase or decrease in certain subjects' importance - this proved more or less as a check upon the preceding comparisons. Through this study of college catalogues came knowledge of the actual practice in teacher training schools in 1931 and 1941.

In a paper of this type it seemed necessary to present more than the minimum standards represented by state education boards and the actual teacher training requirements of the colleges of this period. Reasons for such trends as were observed should be discovered. Consequently an investigation was undertaken of the attitudes and suggestions of leading music educators pertinent to the subject of music teachers' training; these men certainly reflected the ideal and goal in music education and wielded as great an influence on the actual situation as any other factor. With this purpose in mind, all the Music Educators National Journals from 1931 to 1941 were studied for articles bearing on the subject of teachers' training, as well as these years of the Year-Book of Music Educators National Conference (Sections on Teachers' Training, primarily). In addition, any other material or books concerned with the problem were carefully read. These articles cast light on the reason for certain trends as well as reflect-

ed the discrepancy between ideals and actual practices.

The study of state requirements for instrumental and general or vocal teachers in 1931 and 1941, of college courses for both types of teachers in these years, and of the ideals of prominent music educators in regard to teachers' training curricula should present a complete picture of the comparative education of instrumental and vocal music teachers in 1931 and 1941, as well as also reflect the trends of the period.

MINIMUM STANDARDS SET BY THE STATES IN 1931 AND 1941

Although all the forty-eight states were contacted for both 1931 and 1941 certification requirements, the returns for 1931 were small in comparison to the 1941 replies; seventeen states sent information concerning 1931; forty-one states plus the District of Columbia, for 1941.

From the data on hand, it appeared that proportionately fewer states required bachelor's degrees for music teacher's certification in 1931 than 1941. In 1931, out of seventeen states only seven specified bachelor's degrees; the other ten were satisfied with less, and of these only two required three years training; three demanded two years college education. In one state a distinction was made between the instrumental and vocal teachers' certification - the vocal teacher to take a three year college course; the instrumentalist to take twenty-four semester hours of public school music and also possess the ability to play an instrument. From the seven states requiring bachelor's degrees for music teachers, only three mentioned content material to be covered in the course: Oregon specified forty hours in methods, musicianship, education, choral training and practice teaching; North Carolina, thirty

hours in music and education, including three hours in voice; Maryland, thirty hours in music and education.

In 1941 the reverse situation appeared. The larger number of states demanded bachelor's degrees for certification of music teachers. Twenty-four states required degrees; only ten allowed teaching with less than four years training; three other states allowed the substitution of passing state examinations for possession of a bachélor's degree; four different states issued two types of certificates, one of which required a degree, the other being granted on less education. Where there was a distinction between the instrumental and vocal training, in three states, a degree was required of the vocal teacher; several years (5 - 6) previous professional experience, of the instrumentalist.

Of those specifying a bachelor's degree in 1941, twenty-one listed the necessary numbers of hours in music:

Table I - State Specified Hours in Music - 1941

Number of music hours required	States requiring degrees	States not requiring degrees
10 - 20	2	5
20 - 30	9	4
30 - 50	4	
50 - 60	6	

These hours were distributed among different courses but not all states seemed agreed on the relative importance of the various subjects. Those most commonly mentioned were theory and harmony with sight-singing, music methods, and applied music; other subjects listed were music history and conducting, with orchestration suggested by one state. Where the applied music was specified, it was about evenly divided between instrumental and vocal work.

The certification of private teachers seemed to have no bearing on the problem, since all information concerned only private instruction by private teachers (sometimes making use of the school building) in order that high school credit toward graduation might be granted students for their music lessons.

In summary, where there was a distinction between the vocal and instrumental training, in both years of 1931 and 1941, the educational or professional requirements were higher for the vocalist but the musical standards set for the instrumentalist were as high or higher. All states' standards for both types of teachers had increased through the ten year period as appears from the following table:

Table II - State Requirements for Certification

	1931 Number of States Represented:
States requiring degree	- 7 - 41%
States not requiring degree	10 - 59%
States requiring examination or degree	0
States requiring vocal degree or instrumental background	0
States specifying number of hours in music	3 - 17%

	1941 Number of States Represented:
States requiring degree	24 - 54%
States not requiring degree	14 - 32% *
States requiring examination or degree	3 - 7%
States requiring vocal degree or instrumental background	3 - 7%
States specifying number of hours in music	21 - 48%

* Four states represent second class certificates.

ACTUAL PRACTICE IN THE TRAINING OF MUSIC TEACHERS IN 1931 AND 1941.

The data from the college catalogues in 1931 and 1941 proved most helpful in the study of the actual music teachers' training in this period. Out of forty-nine schools sending material for 1931, fifteen had specialized courses - one type for instrumental work, the other for vocal or general music teaching; thirty-four schools offered only one general course with emphasis more upon vocal music teaching. Included in the colleges with specialized courses were two with three different programs - one each, for the instrumental, vocal, and general music teacher.

On the basis of sixty-six school catalogues the situation for 1941 was as follows: thirty-three colleges or conservatories had one general course only; thirty-one had separate courses for the instrumental and vocal teacher; two listed specialized courses, but the only difference appeared to be in the applied music requirement so they henceforth shall be listed as one course colleges. Out of the group with specialized courses, two schools offered three distinct programs - for the instrumental, vocal, or general music teacher.

Over the ten year period, from 1931 to 1941, two colleges dropped the field of public school music from their curriculum, but at the same time five other schools added such a course. Seven institutions that in 1931 were offering one general course had two separate, instrumental and vocal, programs in 1941; one college, however, decreased its offering in this period from two to one general course, while another school, although still mentioning two programs in 1941, made no distinction between them except in the field of applied music.

Interest in public school music as a separate field seemed to increase between 1931 and 1941, and was marked by a tendency towards specialization. It must have been assumed that the general and vocal teachers had need for the same type of training since there was no additional number of schools setting up a separate vocal course apart from the general teachers' training program. Below is a representation of the general situation:

Percentage of schools with specialized courses - 1931 - 28.5%
Percentage of schools with specialized courses - 1941 - 47%
Percentage of schools with one general course - 1931 - 71.5%
Percentage of schools with one general course - 1941 - 53%

Not only did these types of courses fluctuate during this period but the hours deemed necessary for graduation also varied. It was shown, by following the same school's requirements in 1931 and 1941, that seventeen colleges increased the number of hours for graduation; thirteen decreased their hours, - while only six remained the same. This obviously pointed to dissatisfaction with the music education curriculum, since by far the smallest number of institutions made no effort to improve their program in some way, by changing their graduation credits.

Taking a survey of all schools sending information for 1931 and 1941, it was found that the larger number of colleges in both years required 120 to 130 hours for graduation, with a smaller number - about half as many - showing completed courses of 130 to 140 hours, - the proportion holding about the same for both years. (Table I. p. 15) It is an interesting fact that although many states allowed teaching with less than a bachelor's degree, only three colleges in 1931, and no college in 1941, offered just two or three year courses. This made it appear that the states took no initiative in the field of music education but followed the direction set by the colleges.

Table I - Graduation Requirements (1931-1941)

A - Relative Emphasis

1931

Schools	120-130 hrs. for G.	130-140 hrs. for G.	Less than 120 hrs. for G.
One Course	22	8	3
Two Course	8	4	0
Total	30 - 66-2/3%	12 - 26-2/3%	3 - 6-2/3%

1941

One Course	23	6	0
Two Course	16	13	0
Total	39 - 67-1/5%	19 - 32-4/5%	0

B - Same School Study

Schools	No. increasing G.	No. decreasing G.	No. remaining the same
One Course	11	7	4
Two Course	6	6	2
Total	17 - 47-1/3%	13 - 36%	6 - 16-2/3%

C - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

1931 Schools	More G for I.	More G for V.	Same amount for both
Two Course	8 - 67%	3 - 25%	1 - 8%
1941			
Two Course	12 - 41%	4 - 14%	13 - 45%

From a study of Table I it may be assumed that, generally speaking, schools with two specialized courses required more hours for graduation than the one course institutions. Possibly it was because such schools were a bit more progressive and consequently saw newer demands made upon the music teacher, necessitating more content in the training courses.

Where there was a distinction in 1931 between the number of hours specified for instrumental and vocal music teachers, in the larger number of colleges, the program for the instrumentalist included the most hours; in 1941 the schools were about equally divided - some with a larger program for the instrumentalist, others with the same load for both vocal and instrumental teachers. (Table I) This fact was rather surprising in light of the state certification laws which demanded the same or a more liberal education for vocal teachers. In none of the tabulated results were there any sectional tendencies on which to base any conclusions.

In the study of the content of these courses for the training of music teachers, the material was arranged in seven large classifications:

1. The academic or liberal arts field, which included the cultural (non-music, non-vocat-

ional) subjects.

2. General education, in which was grouped general psychology.
3. Specific music methods.
4. Practice teaching.
5. Applied music, development of student's skill in performance of music.
6. Ensemble.
7. Musicianship, which embraces all subjects purposing to increase the student's knowledge in music.

During 1931, in schools offering two specialized courses, there were no instances of the instrumental course including more academic work than the vocal; yet there were almost as many cases of the vocal teacher receiving more academic studies as those where both types of teachers received an equal amount. (Table II p.18) This corresponded with the situation mentioned in the state certification laws and probably was due to the fact that many professional players without educational courses and academic background were teaching in the schools so that, to compete with them, emphasis was placed on music subjects instead of general cultural courses.

In 1941 there seemed to be a tendency to provide

Table II - Liberal Arts Requirements (1931-1941)

A - Relative Emphasis

1931

Schools	50+ hrs. in L. A.	30-50 hrs. (in L.A.)	10-30 hrs. (in L.A.)	Less than 10 (in L.A.)
One Course	4	5	14	3
Two Course	1	6	7	0
Total	5 - 12-1/2%	11 - 27-1/2%	21 - 52-1/2%	3 - 7-1/2%

1941

One Course	3	16	12	0
Two Course	1	10	14	1
Total	4 - 7%	26 - 45-1/2%	26 - 45-1/2%	1 - 2%

B - Same School Study

Schools	No. increasing L.A.	No. decreasing L. A.	No. remaining the same
One Course	14	5	3
Two Course	4	5	4
Total	18 - 51%	10 - 29%	7 - 20%

C - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

1931 Schools	More L.A. for I	More L. A. for V	Same amt. for both
Two Course	0	6 - 43%	8 - 57%
1941			
Two Course	4 - 14%	5 - 19%	18 - 67%

a similar academic background for both types of teachers since the greater number of schools required the same hours in this field for the instrumentalist and the vocalist. A smaller number of colleges specified more hours in liberal arts for the vocalists than the instrumentalists; still fewer schools granted more liberal arts courses to the instrumental than the vocal teacher. (Table II)

When one considers the importance attached to liberal arts in the training of music teachers, it is apparent that its value was appreciated more in 1941 than in 1931. After observing the same schools in both years, it was found that the greatest number of schools increased their liberal arts requirements,and although some decreased their hours in academic subjects,the smallest group kept the same program. (Table II) Possibly this tendency was the result of the increasing emphasis placed on intergration in this period, which necessitated a wide background on the part of the music teacher. The increase in the number of hours scheduled for academic subjects was much more noticeable in one course colleges.

The above tendency is shown in surveying all the colleges sending information for these years. There was more of an increase for liberal arts in one course schools than in those with specialized courses. Both types of schools

grouped together pointed toward a very slight increasing emphasis for liberal arts. In 1941 the schools were evenly divided between a load of 30 to 50 or 10 to 30 academic hours, as represented on Table II.

The same state of fluctuation evidently existed for the music teacher in the field of education (non-specific methods and principles). A study of the same school over the ten years disclosed that 38% increased the amount of general education (psychology in this classification); 35-1/2% decreased their requirements, while only 26-1/2% remained the same. (Table III p.21)

A study of all the pertinent material sent for the years 1931 and 1941 showed that although there was an increase in education courses in the later years, the larger proportion of colleges still required between 10 - 20 hours. (Table III) This amount of standardization was possibly due to state requirements in education for all teachers and applied, therefore, to all music teachers also.

In comparing the general education requirements of both the instrumental and vocal teachers, again the standardization of the state law was apparent. In each year, 1931 or 1941, the majority of schools listed the same amount of education for both types of teachers; in very few cases

Table III - Education Requirements (1931-1941)

A Relative Emphasis

1931

Schools	20+ hrs. in E.	10-20 hrs. (in E.)	Less than 10 hrs. (in E.)
One Course	3	16	5
Two Course	2	10	1
Total	5 - 14%	26 - 70%	6 - 16%

1941

Schools	20+ hrs. in E.	10-20 hrs. (in E.)	Less than 10 hrs. (in E.)
One Course	4	26	1
Two Course	1	20	4
Total	5 - 9%	46 - 82%	5 - 9%

B - Same School Study

Schools	No. increasing E.	No. decreasing E.	No. remaining the same
One Course	7	9	5
Two Course	6	3	4
Total	13 - 38%	12 - 35-1/2%	9 - 26-1/2%

C - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

1931

Schools	More E. for I.	More E. for V.	Same amount for both
Two Courses	0	2 - 15%	11 - 85%

1941

Schools			
Two Courses	0	1 - 4%	24 - 96%

the vocal teacher had more education courses than the instrumental teacher. (Table III).

While there was an increase in the study of general educational principles, there was a marked decrease in the number of hours allotted to specific music methods. From a study of the same colleges over this period, the decline was obvious in both one and two course schools. This same fact was observed in studying the situation in both years of all the schools. In 1931 the majority of schools taught ten or more hours of methods; in 1941 the larger number of institutions required only 5 to 10 hours of methods. This tendency was perhaps more noticeable in the general course colleges. (Table IV. p. 23) Possibly this did not mean less emphasis upon music methods as much as improvement in the organization and teaching of the content of these courses, since they were more in the experimental stage than the other more traditional courses. Then too, educators were stressing general principles for the prospective music teacher rather than specific methods.[1]

In a comparison of the specialized courses for instrumental and vocal teachers, there was no doubt that methods were considered more important for the vocal instructor. In both years, the vocal teacher had either more

[1] Dykema, The Music Teacher, Trainer or Educator, Education Magazine, Oct. 1933, p. 85.

Table IV - Music Methods Requirements (1931-1941)

A - Relative Emphasis

1931

Schools	10+ hrs. in M.	5-10 hrs. (in M.)	2 - 5 hrs. (in M.)
One Course	14	11	2
Two Course	9	2	3
Total	23 - 56%	13 - 32%	5 - 12%

1941

Schools	10+ hrs. in M.	5-10 hrs. (in M.)	2 - 5 hrs. (in M.)
One Course	7	20	3
Two Course	14	15	1
Total	21 - 35%	35 - 58%	4 - 7%

B - Same School Study

Schools	No. increasing in M.	No. decreasing in M.	No. remaining the same
One Course	5	12	4
Two Course	3	7	2
Total	8 - 24%	19 - 58%	6 - 18%

C - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

1931

Schools	More M for I.	More M. for V.	Same amount for both
Two Course	0	7 - 47%	8 - 53%

1941

Schools	More M for I.	More M. for V.	Same amount for both
Two Course	1 - 3%	15 - 52%	13 - 45%

or the same number of hours in methods courses. Yet, there was very little uniformity among the different schools: some had the same number of methods hours for the instrumental and vocal teachers in 1931 and included more such hours for the vocalist in 1941; others reversed the situation; again, some had an equal amount of methods for both in 1931 and increased only the number of hours for the instrumentalist in 1941. (Table IV).

It is difficult from just a catalogue study to be too sure of the content of these methods courses - as Chauncey King found in his survey on methods courses of sixty-seven colleges, since there was such a variation in the terminology for the same type of courses.[1] However, in looking over these courses, it appeared that primary and intermediate methods were mostly vocal in character; junior and senior high methods generally included instrumental (band organization, etc.) and vocal practices. In the light of this grouping, with a study of one course schools, the emphasis was by far upon vocal methods. Does vocal music necessitate more method instruction than the instrumental?

One Course Schools	1931	1941
Number with more vocal methods	14	17
Number with more combined methods	4	6

---

1. King, College Courses in Music Education, Music Supervisors Journal, Oct. 1933, p. 26.

In 1941, out of twenty-three schools giving detailed information on methods courses, only seven listed instrumental methods as a separate course; yet this was an increase over 1931. The decrease in methods hours, observed previously, occurred in the vocal or combined vocal and instrumental courses. (Class instruction by instruments was not included in instrumental methods but under applied music.)

In the light of this fluctuation in methods courses, came Mr. King's interesting statement that educators felt the need of music teachers for general principles rather than specific methods.[1]

The influence of state demands was felt in the field of student teaching in the same way that was observed in general education courses- causing more uniformity of practice. In the college curriculum, it appeared that the amount of student teaching was becoming standardized with equal hours for all teachers. During 1931 the larger number of colleges demanded the same amount of student teaching for both instrumental and vocal teachers, with an increasing number following this practice in 1941. (Table V. p.26).

---

1. King, College Courses in Music Education, Music Supervisors Journal, Oct. 1933, p. 26.

Table V - Practice Teaching Requirements (1931-1941)

A - Relative Emphasis

1931

Schools	10+ hrs. in P. T.	5-10 hrs. (in P.T.)	5 hrs. (in P.T.)
One Course	3	6	9
Two Course	3	4	7
Total	6 - 18-3/4%	10 - 31-1/4%	16 - 50%

1941

Schools	10+ hrs. in P. T.	5-10 hrs. (in P.T.)	5 hrs. (in P.T.)
One Course	4	10	10
Two Course	1	15	8
Total	5 - 10%	25 - 52%	18 - 38%

Note: In 1931, 8 schools did not mention courses, nor number of hours; in 1941, 3 schools stated neither courses nor number of hours.

B - Same School Study

Schools	No. increasing P. T.	No. decreasing P. T.	No. remaining the same
One Course	6	4	7
Two Course	5	2	6
Total	11 - 37%	6 - 20%	13 - 43%

C - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

1931

Schools	More P. T. for I	More P. T. for V	Same amount for both
Two Course	2 - 13%	2 - 13%	11 - 74%

1941

Schools	More P. T. for I	More P. T. for V	Same amount for both
Two Course	2 - 8%	2 - 8%	20 - 84%

Uniformity of thinking on this subject was apparent when surveying the same schools over this ten year period. More colleges required either the same amount or more practice teaching in 1941 as in 1931. In a survey of all schools, the development was more towards stabilization around 5 to 10 hours - with slight change in any direction. (Table V).

The most uniformity in courses for the instrumentalist and vocalist seemed to be in the field of general education and in student teaching. This was true in both 1931 and 1941, with an increasing percentage of schools making an equal requirement in the latter year. Possibly this was the effect of state certification laws which demanded minimum hours in these fields regardless of the subject to be taught. Methods courses were included either more in the vocal course or were listed as similar hours for both types of teachers, with little change over the ten year period. In 1931 colleges were about evenly divided between requiring more hours of liberal arts for the vocalist or an equal amount for both types of teachers; but in 1941 most schools specified equal hours for both, a few colleges listing more courses for the instrumental program; a few others, more for the vocal.

No definite trend was observed in liberal arts, general education, methods, or practice teaching, but the

figures indicated a tendency for more standardization among colleges in 1931 than 1941 and suggested increased interest in liberal arts, general education and student teaching with diminished emphasis upon methods.

Musicianship, which includes all subjects that increase the student's knowledge of music, had not remained static in the emphasis placed upon it by the various schools. Under this heading also are found music electives, although applied music and ensemble are excluded, dealing as they do with music skills and consequently studied as a separate field. Uncertainty as to the relative importance of musicianship courses during the ten year period was most obvious when comparing the same schools' offerings in 1931 and 1941; about as many colleges increased their requirements as decreased them; a fewer number remained the same (Table VI. p. 29).

When judging all schools over this period, however, the general situation did not appear to have changed so much. Most schools offered 20 to 30 hours in the field in both 1931 and 1941 with an almost equal number of schools specifying 30 to 40 hours. A comparison of instrumental and vocal courses showed that while most colleges in these years required the same number of hours for both, the instrumentalist spent more time in the field if any distinction was made. (Table VI).

Table VI - Musicianship Requirements (1931-1941)

A - Relative Emphasis

1931

Schools	40+ hrs. in M.	30-40 hrs. (in M)	20-30 hrs. (in M)	Less than 20 hrs. (in M)
One Course	6	10	12	3
Two Course	1	6	5	2
Total	7 - 15%	16 - 36%	17 - 38%	5 - 11%

1941

Schools	40+ hrs. in M.	30-40 hrs. (in M)	20-30 hrs. (in M)	Less than 20 hrs. (in M)
One Course	5	13	15	2
Two Course	7	7	11	0
Total	12 - 20%	20 - 33-1/3%	26 - 43-1/3%	2 - 3-1/3%

B - Same School Study

Schools	No. increasing M.	No decreasing M.	No remaining the same
One Course	11	14	4
Two Course	6	4	5
Total	17 - 39%	18 - 41%	9 - 20%

C - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

1931 Schools	More M. for I	More M. for V	Same amount for both
Two Course	3 - 20%	1 - 7%	11 - 73%
1941 Two Course	9 - 37-1/2%	3 - 12-1/2%	12 - 50%

Table VII - Form and Analysis Requirements (1931-1941)

A - Relative Emphasis

1931

Schools	4+ hrs. in A.	4 hrs. (in A,)	Less than 4 hrs.(in A.)	(A) course not mentioned
One Course	4	4	4	19
Two Course	1	3	1	10
Total	5 - 11%	7 - 15%	5 - 11%	29 - 63%

1941

Schools	4+ hrs. in A.	4 hrs. (in A,)	Less than 4 hrs.(in A.)	(A) course not mentioned
One Course	1	7	4	25
Two Course	1	10	1	13
Total	2 - 3%	17 - 27%	5 - 8%	38 - 62%

B - Same School Study

Schools	No increasing in A.	No decreasing in A.	No. remaining the same
One Course	3	5	5
Two Course	0	2	3
Total	3 - 17%	7 - 39%	8 - 44%

C - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

1931

Schools	More A for I	More A for V	Same amount for both
Two Course	0	0	5 - 100%

1941

Schools	More A for I	More A for V	Same amount for both
Two Course	0	0	12 - 100%

Within the field of musicianship, some subjects were evidently not considered too necessary for a music teachers' background. Out of thirty-nine schools listing complete detailed courses, only three mentioned composition as a separate course in 1941. Form and analysis as an individual subject was declining or just holding its own. Since the subject was never too popular, this picture remained about the same in 1941 as in 1931, except that the colleges gave either four hours or none at all in 1941, while in 1931 shorter courses were more in evidence. (Table VII. p. 30). In comparing the two types of training, in every case the requirements were the same wherever the subject was specified.

Counterpoint is another subject that has not received universal recognition in teacher training institutions. A survey of the same schools over the ten year period revealed that no college added a counterpoint requirement; three schools dropped it; and fourteen schools retained it. Out of this group, one institution increased the amount of counterpoint, while two others decreased the required hours. The overall view showed a small percentage of schools teaching counterpoint as a required course in 1941 and 1931. In 1931 there was no difference in the counterpoint course for instrumental and vocal teachers; in 1941 two schools specified it for instrumentalists only.

Table VIII - Counterpoint Requirements (1931-1941)

1931 -	One Course School		Two Course School	Total
	Number of schools	- 31	15	46
	Number teaching counterpoint	- 13 - 42%	9 - 60%	22 - 48%

1941 -	One Course School		Two Course School	Total
	Number of schools	- 37	25	62
	Number teaching counterpoint	- 14 - 38%	10 - 40%	24 - 39%

In 1931 there was no difference in the counterpoint course for instrumental and vocal teachers; in 1941 two schools specified it for instrumentalists only.

Possibly the material in the above course had not been omitted or dropped, but integrated into other courses. Such integration was very apparent in the field of sightsinging and eartraining which had been, in some cases, incorporated into the harmony course. Because of this fact it was more difficult to judge accurately what was happening. Through a study of the same schools over this period, it was found that about an equal number of them increased, decreased, remained the same, or integrated the material into a harmony course. In spite of this fluctuation, the general picture of the situation did not appear to change too radically - the larger number of colleges in 1941 offering eight or more hours in sightsinging (where it was a

Table IX - Sightsinging and Eartraining Requirements (1931-1941)

A - Relative Emphasis

1931

Schools	8+ hrs. in S.S.	Less than 8 hrs. in S.S.
One Course	15	14
Two Course	6	8
Total	21 - 48-1/2%	22 - 51-1/2%

1941

One Course	12	11
Two Course	9	8
Total	21 - 52-1/2%	19 - 47-1/2%

Note: The integration of sightsinging into the harmony course was the reason for the small number of schools for reference in 1941.

B - Same School Study

Schools	No. increasing in S.S.	No. decreasing S. S.	No remaining the same	No. integrating S. S. into harmony
One Course	6	7	4	9
Two Course	3	4	5	1
Total	9 - 23-1/3%	11 - 30%	9 - 23-1/3%	9 - 23-1/3%

C - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

1931

Schools	More SS for I.	More S.S. for V.	Same amount for both
Two Course	0	2 - 14%	12 - 86%

1941

Two Course	0	0	17 - 100%

separate course), a slight increase over 1931. (Table IX. p.33).

When the two types of courses had been compared - instrumental and vocal - it was found that in 1941 all were required to take the sane number of hours of eartraining and sightsinging, while in 1931, out of fourteen schools, two listed more hours of sightsinging for the vocal teacher. (Table IX)

The integration of harmony and sightsinging made it also difficult to judge whether the actual amount of harmony increased or decreased during this period. A comparison of the two teacher-training courses, instrumental and vocal, revealed that, in both years, the majority of colleges required the same amount of harmony for each. (Table X, p.35).

Harmony seemed to have established itself as a basic course in the curriculum since it was moving in the direction of increased requirements - a tendency revealed by a study of all the colleges during these years. Thus, in harmony as well as in sightsinging and eartraining, the definite fact of integration was made manifest and there was also observed an increase in the number of hours required in the subject. (Table X.)

Table X - Harmony Requirements (1931-1941)

A - Relative Emphasis

Schools	10+ hrs. in H.	10+ hrs. (in H) * (with S.S.)	Less than 10 hrs. (in H)
1931			
One Course	16	1	14
Two Course	9	1	4
Total	25 - 56%	2 - 4%	18 - 40%
1941			
One Course	20	13	4
Two Course	15	5	4
Total	35 - 57-1/2%	18 - 29-1/2%	8 - 13%

*Sightsinging

B - Same School Study

Schools	No. increasing H.	No decreasing H.	No remaining the same
One Course	14	7	8
Two Course	9	0	5
Total	23 -(-8*)=15-43%	7 - 20%	13 - 37%

*(Note: 8 schools increasing the harmony requirements have integrated sightsinging into the courses; this number is not included in the percentages.)

C - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

Schools	More H for I.	More H for V.	Same amount for both
1931			
Two Course	1 - 7%	0	14 - 93%
1941			
Two Course	1 - 5%	2 - 9%	19 - 86%

With the history and appreciation of music subjects, the two types of teachers had practically the same requirements, while a survey of the same schools over this period showed no steadfast movement in any direction - some increasing, some decreasing the load. (Table XI. p.37). Thus, the general situation remained unchanged for both years, with the majority of schools teaching above four hours in history and appreciation.

The importance of conducting to the music teacher was evidently felt by the colleges since there was a definite trend toward increasing or at least retaining the same amount in the program - an increase particularly noticeable in one course schools. This trend was corroborated by a general survey of the colleges. (Table XII. p.38). Where there were two specialized types of courses in a college, there was much more of a tendency to have the same hours in conducting for both the instrumentalist and vocalist in 1941 than in 1931. (Table XII.)

Orchestration is a subject that was deemed relatively unimportant for the general music teacher by some colleges. It was not mentioned as a separate course by some; others required it for instrumental majors only. In both years, if a distinction was made between the two types of teachers, less orchestration was included in the vocal course. (Table XIII, p. 39)

Table XI - Music History and Appreciation Requirements

(1931-1941)

A - Relative Emphasis

1931

Schools	4+ hrs. in M.H.	4 hrs. in M.H.	Less than 4 hrs. (in M.H.)
One Course	27	5	1
Two Course	9	5	1
Total	36 - 75%	10 - 21%	2 - 4%

1941

One Course	32	6	1
Two Course	18	7	0
Total	50 - 78%	13 - 20%	1 - 2%

B - Same School Study

Schools	No. increasing M. H.	No. decreasing M. H.	No. remaining the same
One Course	8	11	8
Two Course	2	4	9
Total	10 - 24%	15 - 36%	17 - 40%

C - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

1931

Schools	More M. H. for I.	More M. H. for V.	Same amount for both
Two Course	0	1 - 7%	14 - 93%

1941

Two Course	1 - 4%	1 - 4%	22 - 92%

Table XII - Conducting Requirements (1931-1941)

A - Relative Emphasis

1931	4 hrs. in C.	2-4 hrs.(in C)	1 hr. in C.
Schools			
One Course	4	10	4
Two Course	2	9	0
Total	6 - 20-1/2%	19 - 65-1/2%	4 - 14%
1941			
One Course	10	17	5
Two Course	14	9	1
Total	24 - 43%	26 - 46%	6 - 11%

B - Same School Study

Schools	No. increasing C.	No. decreasing C.	No. remaining same
One Course	8	0	10
Two Course	4	0	7
Total	12 - 41%	0	17 - 59%

(Note: This did not include five schools who did not mention the course in 1931 and listed it in 1941. It should be stated that not all schools list conducting as a separate course.)

C - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

1931	More C for I.	More C for V.	Same amount for both
Two Course	4 - 36%	2 - 18%	5 - 46%
1941			
Two Course	4 - 16-2/3%	0	20 - 83-1/3%

Table XIII - Orchestration requirements (1931-1941)

A - Relative Emphasis

1931

Schools	4+ hrs. in O.	4 hrs. in O.	Less than 4 hrs. (in O)	No course mentioned
One Course	2	8	10	11
Two Course	0	8	6	1
Total	2 - 4%	16 - 35%	16 - 35%	12 - 26%

1941

Schools	4+ hrs. in O.	4 hrs. in O.	Less than 4 hrs. (in O)	No course mentioned
One Course	1	12	12	10
Two Course	5	12	5	3
Total	6 - 10%	24 - 40%	17 - 28-1/3%	13 - 21-2/3%

B - Same School Study

School	No. increasing O.	No. decreasing O.	No. remaining same
One Course	5	7	7
Two Course	4	2	7
Total	9 - 28%	9 - 28%	14 - 44%

C - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

1931

Schools	More O for I.	More O for V.	Same amount for both
Two Course	4 - 29%	0	10 - 71%

1941

Schools	More O for I.	More O for V.	Same amount for both
Two Course	7 - 32%	0	15 - 68%

Consideration of the same schools for the ten year period showed uncertainty as to the amount of orchestration necessary in the course. Some schools increased, others decreased the amount, although in most schools, the number of hours required remained unchanged. All the changes appeared to be going in the direction of requiring four hours in orchestration for there was slightly more uniformity in 1941 than in 1931. (Table XIII).

In comparing the musicianship requirements, it appeared that if the two courses - instrumental and vocal - did not agree in the number of hours in each subject, the demands were heavier on the instrumentalist. In some cases counterpoint was included in the instrumental course only; in two instances more sightsinging was expected of the vocal teacher. Where the same requirement was not made, more hours of orchestration were specified for the instrumental teacher - a tendency that seemed to be increasing - but in conducting, where more hours were listed for the instrumentalist, this inequality was diminishing. Generally speaking, the majority of schools required for both types of training the same number of hours in musicianship and in the individual subjects within the field. As to the individual courses, all schools seem to be working toward uniformity of requirements for both teachers with the exception of orchestration

to which, in some colleges, the instrumentalist devoted more time.

There was relatively little change in the importance attached to the field of musicianship over this period; the subjects gaining in popularity were harmony and conducting while form and analysis and counterpoint as separate subjects were diminishing in emphasis, possibly due as much to the fact of their integration into other subjects, such as harmony, (accounting for the increase of hours of harmony in 1941) as to the fact of the actual omission of subject matter. Other subjects within this field remained practically unchanged over this ten year period.

Gradually more importance seemed to be attaching itself to applied music in the college curriculum. Under this heading were grouped all courses concerned with development of performance skills on any instrument, and included class instrumental instruction, which, possibly, some might classify under methods. Since knowledge of the instrument seemed to be the primary interest of the class, the course was listed under applied music. Taking the same schools over this ten year period left no doubt that all schools saw a great need for music teachers to be performers as well as possessors of musical knowledge. This same observation is warranted by a survey of all schools sending infor-

Table XIV - Applied Music Requirements (1931-1941)

A - Relative Emphasis

1931

Schools	24+ hrs. in App. M.	16 - 24 hrs. (in App. M.)	Less than 16 hrs.(in App.M)
One Course	9	12	8
Two Course	7	4	4
Total	16 - 36-1/3%	16 - 36-1/3%	12 - 27-1/3%
1941			
One Course	16	12	9
Two Course	20	3	1
Total	36 - 59%	15 - 25%	10 - 16%

B - Same School Study

Schools	No. increasing App. M.	No. decreasing App. M.	No. remaining the same
One Course	20	4	3
Two Course	9	3	2
Total	29 - 71%	7 - 17%	5 - 12%

C - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

1931

Schools	More App. M. for I.	More App. M. for V.	Same Amt. for both
Two Course	9 - 64%	2 - 14%	3 - 22%
1941 Schools			
Two Course	12 - 50%	3 - 12-1/2%	9 - 37-1/2%

mation for these years of 1931 and 1941. (Table XIV. p.42).

By comparing the instrumental and vocal courses, it was found that although in 1931 the instrumentalist had more applied music, there was a tendency to equalize the amount for both types of teachers ten years later; yet even in 1941 the larger group of schools provided more opportunity for the instrumentalist in applied music. (Table XIV).

If the courses in class instrumental instruction are omitted from the field of applied music, the conclusions remain practically the same - the tendency still apparent toward the increase of applied music in the teachers' training program. (Table XV. p.44) Even after excluding class instrumental lessons from the consideration of applied music, in the one course schools, (the few colleges that specify detailed requirements) more time was spent in instrumental than vocal training. When we omitted again this class instrumental instruction from applied music, a tendency to equalize the amount of practical music for both training programs was more apparent. (Table XV).

Thus, applied music was becoming more important in this ten year period, and although originally the instrumentalist was a better performer than the vocalist, action was made manifest in the direction of equalizing the training

Table XV - Applied Music Requirements (1931-1941)

(Omitting Class instruction of instruments)

A - Relative Emphasis

1931 Schools	16+ hrs. in App. M.	8 - 16 hrs. (App. M.)	No hrs. (in App. M.)
One & Two Courses	24 - 55%	16 - 36%	4 - 9%
1941 Schools			
One & Two Courses	46 - 76%	13 - 21%	2 - 3%

B - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

1931 Schools	More App. M. of I.	More App. M. for V.	Same Amt. for both
Two Course	5 - 36%	4 - 28%	5 - 36%
1941 Schools			
Two Course	7 - 29%	6 - 25%	11 - 46%

C - Comparative Vocal and Instrumental Instruction

(One Course Schools)

1931 Schools	More Inst. Instruction	More Vocal Instruction	Same amount of each
One Course	9 - 56%	0	7 - 44%
1941 Schools			
One Course	11 - 64-1/2%	0	6 - 35%

in both fields. On the whole, however, the music teacher was a better instrumentalist than a vocalist, judging from the time required in both fields.

As in the methods courses, the lack of standardization of applied music subjects made it difficult to arrive at any conclusion as to actual standards achieved in this field. Some schools granted credit for one hour's daily practice; others gave the same credit for two hours' daily practice. Then, some colleges required two lessons a week, and others were satisfied with one. Most schools seemed to require one hour's daily practice for one hour credit.

Under the above arrangements, the majority of lessons were private; usually twice as many class lessons were necessary to receive the equivalent credit. In general, most schools required private instruction in applied music, with the exception of orchestral instruments which were given in class lessons. Several schools had class voice lessons but private instrumental instruction. Only a very few colleges used class lessons exclusively as a basis for their applied music.

There was in 1941 more of an attempt to standardize within each school the granting of credit for applied

music, by withholding it until the student had passed an examination before a faculty board. In this way, credit was dependent upon objective accomplishment rather than time devoted to the subject, although certain minimum time requirements were a pre-requisite to the examination. Other schools required student participation in recitals, that a certain amount of performance skill was guaranteed the music teacher. (Very few schools mentioned either in the catalogue, which may be the result of no requirement or may possibly be merely that no requirement was stated.) However, there were more schools mentioning either specification in 1941 than in 1931, which showed, at least, that more importance was attached to these requirements in 1941.

Although only seven mentioned the faculty examination in 1931; nineteen schools required it in 1941; only six in 1931 mentioned recital performance, while in 1941 it was listed by eleven. Taking the same schools over this period, out of fourteen requiring an examination before the faculty in 1941, only seven of them included it in the course in 1931; and only five in 1931, out of the ten in 1941, mentioned a recital performance requirement.

One other aspect of the music teachers' training was ensemble, which in some schools assumed the role of extra-curricula work and in others was a part of the regular

course. Because of this fact, not all colleges listed it under the required course, while other institutions included it but gave no credit. Although in 1931 the instrumental teacher was given more credit in ensemble, in 1941 more colleges granted equal credit to both types of teachers.

Colleges appeared not to be stabilized upon the amount of ensemble necessary in a music teachers' course. Taking the same schools over the ten year period, it is apparent that as many increased as decreased the amount of ensemble. Only a few remained the same. Consideration of all schools used for the study revealed the same proportional emphasis on ensemble over the ten years; nor did all schools list ensemble as a required study. (Table XVI p. 48)

Thus, although the subject of ensemble was in a state of fluctuation, increasing in some schools and decreasing in others, the general practice in 1931 did not change from that in 1941, with more colleges offering 4 - 8 hours in this field. The idea of having a like amount of ensemble for the instrumental and vocal courses was stronger in 1941 than in 1931 when the instrumental teacher was allowed more credit for the subject. (Table XVI)

From a catalogue study, it appeared that not every college was too selective in its admission of students to the

Table XVI - Ensemble Requirements (1931-1941)

A - Relative Emphasis

1931	8+ hrs. in E.	4-8 hrs. (in E.)	Less than 4 hrs. (in E.)	No credit mentioned
One Course	3	8	1	6
Two Course	6	6	4	1
Total	9 - 25-1/2%	14 - 40%	5 - 14-1/2%	7 - 20%

1941				
One Course	8	12	4	6
Two Course	7	11	1	5
Total	15 - 28%	23 - 43%	5 - 9%	11 - 20%

B - Same School Study

Schools	No. increasing E.	No. decreasing E.	No. remaining the same
One Course	7	5	3
Two Course	4	7	1
Total	11 - 41%	12 - 44%	4 - 15%

C - Comparison of Vocal and Instrumental Courses

1931

Schools	More E. for I.	More E for V.	Same amount for both
Two Course	8 - 62%	3 - 23%	2 - 15%

1941

Two Course	5 - 26%	3 - 16%	11 - 58%

music education training courses, for it is to be assumed that entrance requirements would be listed in a catalogue sent out to prospective students. Standards seemed to be somewhat higher in 1941, but music requirements even then were not mentioned by all schools.

Table XVII - College Entrance Requirements (1931-1941)

Schools	1931	1941
No. requiring sightsinging and eartraining	6	18 *
No. requiring knowledge of theory	6	12 *
No. requiring instrumental training	16	26
Require Grade 1 on instrument	1	2
Require Grade 2 on instrument	5	4
Require Grade 3 on Instrument	2	1
No. making vocal requirement (Good singing voice)	6	8
No. giving entrance test (Not stating exact requirement)	7	19

(*Possibly overlap in requirements)

It would seem, from the data, that colleges were more interested in specialized courses in 1941 than in 1931; and in these programs, generally, the hours listed for graduation were either the same or a higher number required in instrumental course - but the number of colleges specifying the same hours for graduation for both courses had grown

considerably in 1941. Graduation requirements as a whole had not changed very much, the most schools listing 120 - 130 hours.

As for the individual fields themselves, academic subjects did not receive much more emphasis in 1941 than in 1931, although the figures pointed to increased rather than diminishing interest in the field. No great change was apparent in the general education situation but a larger percentage of schools were requiring 10 to 20 hours in 1941, showing more standardization. No striking difference was noted between 1931 and 1941 in practice teaching, except that a few more colleges were requiring additional hours in 1941. Methods courses showed a slight decline in the college program over this period.

More uniformity was observed in the general education courses required for both types of teachers in 1931 and 1941 - with 96% of the colleges listing equal hours in 1941. This same situation was true with regard to practice teaching, but to a lesser degree. In methods, either the prospective vocal teacher had more or the same number of hours as the instrumentalist. Very little difference was noted between 1931 and 1941 in this respect but such difference as there was indicated less similarity in hours between the two courses in 1941. Schools in 1931 were

about evenly divided between those giving more hours in liberal arts to the vocal teacher and those granting equal courses to both types of training. In 1941, however, a larger percentage allowed equal credit to both vocal and instrumental courses in this field, but it still was far from unanimous. (67%)

The field of musicianship itself changed little in relative importance from 1931 to 1941. Within the field, form and analysis, sightsinging, music appreciation, and orchestration were about in the same position in both years; counterpoint was very slightly declining in importance. Harmony and conducting showed an increase in the time allotted to them.

In comparing the subjects offered in both years, to the two types of courses, instrumental and vocal, most schools suggested the same hours in musicianship, with a smaller number granting additional hours to the instrumental. (Just a few include more hours in the vocal course). Strangely enough, more distinction was made in 1941 than in 1931. The same requirements for both courses in the majority of cases held in the subjects of form and analysis, harmony, and history of music. Counterpoint in 1931 was specified alike for vocal and instrumental teachers, but in 1941 more colleges required it for instrumentalists only; in 1931 about an equal

number of schools specified more conducting for the instrumentalist as those that suggested a like amount for both courses, but in 1941 the majority of colleges required the same hours of conducting for the two programs. Although the larger percentage of schools listed the same hours for the vocal as instrumental program, a good number granted more credit to the latter in this subject; this was true in both years.

Applied music advanced over the ten year period. The same schools observed increased their offerings and a larger number of colleges in 1941 were giving twenty-four hours plus in the field than were doing so in 1931. Although in both years the instrumental teacher was generally given more applied music, in 1941 a larger percentage of schools were scheduling an equal amount for the vocal and instrumental program. There was also an indication that the standards for granting credit in applied music were being raised. The general situation for ensemble remained about the same over the ten year period, although within the individual colleges a good deal of fluctuation occurred.

Interestingly enough, although in many subjects the general picture didn't change too radically in 1931 to 1941, when studying the same schools over this period, a state of indecision was seen to exist. While some schools

increased their offerings, others decreased them. The only cases where a decided trend was noticed in observing the same school over this period was in that of conducting (definite increase) and possibly, to a lesser degree, in applied music. This might be explained by the fact that the schools were coming to a standardized uniformity, some raising and some lowering the requirements to reach a mutually desired number of hours; yet in studying the distribution of colleges among the different classifications of hours in each subject for 1941, little basic for such an assumption is found.

STATEMENT BY EDUCATORS OF THE IDEALS IN MUSIC TEACHERS' TRAINING FROM 1931 TO 1941.

Integration was an idea which received much attention and provoked much thought in the years between 1931 and 1941. Gehrkens thought that the emphasis upon the relationship of things, nations, and industry brought integration into the school.[1] When once introduced, it was accepted enthusiastically by some educators but others saw disadvantages.[2] McConathy thought music became only a handmaid to other subjects through integration, and that, consequently, skill in music received scant consideration.[3] Even though it did not receive wholehearted favor, integration had its effect on the educational program in the teacher training institutions. It was suggested that the music teacher was not to teach techniques, but widen musical horizons,[4] and see music in its relationship to other fields. From a study Miss McEachern made in 1932, all leading music educators agreed that sightsinging should be

---

1. Gehrkens, Lessons of the Century, Music Supervisors Journal, Sept. 1936, p. 19.
2. Pitts, Music Education, Isolated and Integrated, Music Supervisors Journal, Sept. 1937, p. 33
3. McConathy, Some Problems in School Music, Music Supervisors Journal, March, 1937, p. 35.
4. Mursell, Music in American Schools, p. 35.

integrated into other courses, particularly with harmony; there was also a suggestion that form and analysis be omitted as a separate course and made a part of all music theory courses.[1]

All music educators seemed to deplore the lack of uniformity among schools for training music teachers. McEachern mentioned, as illustration of this fact, that one institution in 1932 credited almost four times as much music as another.[2] Van Christy lamented the disagreement among music educators as to the content of music colleges' curricula, saw its unfortunate result in the absence of standardization in college courses.[3] Of course, as Birge pointed out, the introduction of music into the schools started as an experiment and this spirit of experimentation encouraged individual initiative to develop new practices - resulting in fluctuation, lack of uniformity.[4] Not only did the educators desire stabilization as to courses required but also in regard to the content of material in these courses, the absence of which was so noticeable in methods, student teaching, and applied

---

1. McEachern, Survey and Evaluation of School Music Teachers in United States, pgs. 39-40.
2. Ibid., pgs. 14-16-47.
3. Van Christy, Weak Links in a Preparation of Music Teachers, M.E.N.C. Yearbook, 1939-40, p. 312.
4. Birge, History of Public School Music in the United States, Chapter 3.

music.[1] Nothing appeared to have been actually done about standardizing the music course, but possibly in time with more discussion, something along this line might be accomplished. McEachern suggested pressure of state certification laws as a means of achieving standardization.[2]

Discontent with the applied music in the training program was marked. The teachers' training symposium of 1936 could not reach an agreement as to the effectiveness of class lessons.[3] It was the consensus of opinion of school music educators that class instruction was of limited value and best used in combination with private instruction.[4] Teachers wanted more band methods and more work with orchestral instruments. Dykema stressed the value of the teachers' ability to be a performer.[6] Dickey suggested examinations in voice and a major instrument at the end of the sophmore year which, with the scholastic record, should determine whether or not a student was to

---

1. King, College Courses in Music Education, Music Supervisors Journal, Oct. 1933, p. 26, Dec. p. 24.
2. McEachern, Survey and Evaluation of School Music Teachers in the U. S. pgs. 105-106 & 114.
3. Teachers' Training Symposium, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1936 pg. 102.
4. McEachern, Survey and Evaluation of School Music Teachers, pg. 26.
5. Ibid. p. 94.
6. Dykema, Music for the Public School Administrator, pg. 106.

continue in music education or transfer to another field.[1] Cheyette pointed out that being a fine musical performer not only increased the respect of the pupils but also assisted the teacher in achieving a finer discrimination in the interpretation of music,[2] a thought not overlooked in the book, School Music as a Career.[3]

Even back in 1929 the bulletin of the Music Supervisors National Conference, stated that a music teacher must be a performer, and, consequently, credit must be given for applied music. In McEachern's survey in 1932, all music educators thought it highly desirous that the music teacher be a solo performer on some instrument, and, as a result, suggested that all music teachers be required to concentrate in one field of applied music to the extent of developing solo ability. To assure a higher standard in applied music, educators favored the granting of credit on the accomplishment basis, by means of proficiency examinations.[4] In a symposium of younger teachers in 1935, the need for more practical music was stated.[5] From a survey

1. Dickey, Bases for Admission to Teacher's Education, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1938, p. 182.
2. Cheyette, Trends in Music Teachers' Education, Music Supervisors Journal, Oct. Nov. 1940, p. 68.
3. Lapp & Douglas, School Music as a Career, p. 11.
4. McEachern, Survey and Evaluation of School Music Teachers in U. S. pgs. 40 - 64.
5. Teachers' Training Symposium, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1935, p. 375.

made by Irving Wolfe, one-fourth of the graduates contacted mentioned the fact that they did not have enough voice study for school music teaching; an additional number desired more piano instruction, especially improvisation. A large proportion wanted more applied music.[1]

The situation concerned with general education did not escape criticism. Anne Pierce said that the inclusion of more music into the curriculum necessitated a decrease of education courses (or a five year course), and mentioned in support of her idea, a study made by Alan Valentine (which was fortified by similar studies of others), who found that knowledge of professional information might be an insignificient factor in teaching success.[2] Doty in his article Training of Music Teachers, agreed that the course devoted too much time to teaching methods.[3] This same attitude was reflected by Judd who stated that there had been gross overlapping of course content and overemphasis upon professional courses.[4] In McEacherns' survey of teachers, 16% wanted the philosophy of education dropped

---

1. Wolfe, Teacher Preparation from the Teachers'Viewpoint, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1939-40, p. 440.
2. Pierce, Studies in Teacher Training M.E.N.C. Yearbook, 1939-40, p. 422.
3. Doty, Training of Music Teachers, M.E.N.C. Yearbook, 1939-40, p. 427.
4. Judd, Raising the Level of the Education of Teachers, School Review, April 1936, p. 260.

from the course, as they found it of no value.[1] Teachers in the field rated general education courses of less value than did music educators in college. In a symposium of teachers, dissatisfaction with the formal methods courses was expressed.[2]

Yet the education courses had their champions. Otterstein said that a well trained musician is not enough - he must be able to associate music with education.[3] McEachern drew a conclusion that education subjects were moderately useful. All music educators in her survey agreed that the aim of the education of school music teachers was to develop music teaching ability which necessitated the general education courses. They also felt that the school music program should set forth principles of music education rather than provide the student with teaching devices.[4] This statement was repeated by Dykema, who mentioned that the music teacher should be educated, not trained - possess general educational principles, not so much specific methods.[5] King attributed this idea to leading educators in

---

1. McEachern, Survey and Evaluation of School Music Teachers in the U. S. pgs. 86 - 89 & 92.
2. Teachers'Training Symposium, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1835, p. 377.
3. Otterstein, Problems of Music Teaching in the Schools, Music Supervisors Journal, Mar. 1934, p. 20.
4. McEachern, Survey and Evaluation of School Music Teachers in the U. S. pgs. 40 & 85.
5. Dykema, Music Teacher, Trainer or Educator, Education Magazine, Oct. 1933, p. 65.

general.[1] Of course, as Thompson suggested, emphasis on methods meant fewer hours on the subject of music itself with consequently less substance in the course.[2]

As for the specific methods courses, much change could be desired: Schultz suggested improvement and standardization of these methods courses.[3] King deplored the lack of uniformity in these courses; Beattie attempted to set up a complete course of methods for all the teacher training period since he was dissatisfied with that aspect of the curriculum.[4]

Great emphasis was placed by educators upon the musicianship of the music teacher in this period. Gildersleeve suggested more music and less methods for the teacher, and Stringham saw a need to develop musicianship as well as pedagogy.[5, 6.] Gehrkens thought that the most important single thing in the training of teachers was the development of musicianship, and believed that there were signs

---

1. King, College Courses in Music, Music Supervisors Journal, Dec. 1933, p. 24.
2. Thompson, College of Music, p. 242.
3. Schultz, Lower Division Courses for Future Teachers of Music, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1937, p. 190.
4. Beattie, Suggestions on Content and Procedure in Music Education, M.S.N.C. Yearbook 1932, p. 211.
5. Gildersleeve, Producers and Consumers of Music Teachers, M.S.N.C. Yearbook 1933, p. 177.
6. Stringham, What Can be done About It, M.S.N.C. Yearbook 1933, p. 186.

of better musicianship in the teacher of 1935 than formerly.[1] Even though Davis said the important thing for a music teacher was that he learn to teach, still he suggested more music in the curriculum (60 - 80 hours).[2] Mursell, stated as a first necessity the development of the widest possible command of music materials.[3] In the symposium of teachers, their weakness showed up more strongly in the field of musicianship.[4] Of course, The Music Educators National Conference suggested in 1921 and also in 1932 that the music course should consist of one-half musicianship, one-fourth education and practice teaching, and one-fourth cultural subjects. The National Association of Schools of Music suggested about the same requirement in education and in practice teaching, but would cut the amount of cultural courses to spend more time on music subjects, especially applied music.[5]

Probably the need for more conducting was expressed as much as for any single subject in this period. The teachers symposium of 1935 and 1936 emphasized the import-

---

1. Holmes, Musical Foundations and Developments, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1935, p. 25.
2. Davis, Whither Music Education, Music Supervisors Journal, 1939, pgs. 45 - 46.
3. Mursell, Music in the American Schools, pgs. 68 - 96.
4. Teachers'Training Symposium, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1935, p. 377.
5. Butterfield, Program for Tennessee High Schools, pgs. 62 - 64.

ance of conducting and expressed a desire for more training along this line.[1] In School Music as a Career, the need for the music teacher to be a good conductor was impressed upon the reader.[2] McEachern's survey reflected a feeling of inadequacy in conducting on the part of the music teacher in service;[3] Wolfe's survey showed the same reaction to the subject of conducting.[4] As Van Christy said, the pity is that so many times a music teacher's reputation depends on his ability as a conductor (chief public performance) and yet it is his weak point.[5]

Counterpoint and composition were listed as having little usefulness for music teachers by educators in 1932 and harmonic analysis was considered of little value by the teachers in service.[6] Sightsinging was deemed so important by Schultz that he would drop from the music education course any student doing poorly in that subject.[7]

---

1. Teachers' Training Symposium, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1935, p. 377.
2. Lapp & Douglass, School Music as a Career, p. 15.
3. McEachern, Survey and Evaluation of School Music Teachers, pg. 91 & 94.
4. Wolfe, Teacher Preparation from a Teacher's Viewpoint, M.E.N.C. Yearbook, 1939-40, p. 441.
5. Van Christy, Weak Links in the Preparation of Music Teachers, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1939-40, p. 312.
6. McEachern, Survey and Evaluation of School Music Teachers, pgs. 86 - 88.
7. Schultz, Lower Division Courses for Future Teachers of Music, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1937, p. 188.

Wolfe found in his survey that teachers in service wanted more keyboard harmony.[1] Norton again stressed the need for fluency in sightsinging and saw a need for training in listening in order that the teacher might become a real musician.[2] Holmes desired to eliminate the poor musician from the music education field by giving proficiency examinations in sightsinging as a pre-requisite to practice teaching.[3] Teachers in service also suggested more sightsinging to be done with materials for music education, as a clinic for materials as well as practice in sightsinging. They wished more operetta methods, practice teaching, practical work with orchestral instruments, methods in class voice instruction, and work in small ensembles.[4] Stopher emphasized the value for music teachers of ensemble by stating its aid in improving music reading.[5]

The field of liberal arts was amply discussed in this period. Shepherd pointed out that the awareness of values in a composer comes from a background of liberal

---

1. Wolfe, Teacher Preparation from a Teacher's Viewpoint, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1939-40, p. 441
2. Norton, Teaching School Music, pgs. 223 to 228.
3. Holmes, Musical Foundations and Developments, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1935, p. 375.
4. McEachern, Survey and Evaluation of School Music, Teachers, pgs. 90 - 94.
5. Stopher, Adequate Ensemble Practice for Colleges and Schools of Music, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1936, p. 390.

arts subjects, and Weinberg stressed that the most distinguished musicians were those with the greatest cultural background, rather than those with the most perfect technique, as illustrated by Paderewski.[1, 2.] Helen Hosmer saw value in a cultural background for musical interpretation.[3] McEachern suggested that liberal arts furnished a common ground on which to meet other teachers and so plan a course more smoothly.[4] Teachers in service seemed to feel the need for more liberal arts - a broader cultural background.[5]

Naturally, concern over the content of the music education course would lead to interest in the pre-requisites for taking that course. Most educators seem to feel that the colleges were too lenient in their admission requirements. Schultz didn't believe in giving credit for beginning work in applied music, which necessitated pre-college training in the subject. John Neff suggested tests, examinations, and interviews for the selection of candidates to the

---

1. Shepherd, Music in Universities, Colleges and Teacher Training Institutions, M.S.N.C. Yearbook 1932, p. 196.
2. Weinberg, Music Pedagogy of the Future, Education Magazine, October 1933, p. 102.
3. Hosmer, Value of a Broad Knowledge of Music to Choral Directors, M.S.N.C. Yearbook 1933, p. 181.
4. McEachern, Survey and Evaluation of School Music Teachers, p. 130.
5. Teachers'Training Symposium, M.E.N.C. Yearbook 1935, p. 377.

schools.[1] McEachern after a thorough study of music teachers' training found that the most difficult obstacle to overcome in the education of the music teacher was the insufficient pre-college musical training. All the music educators in her survey wished a minimum college entrance requirement in music, especially in applied music, to reduce the amount of elementary work done in the training period. She suggested a test of music ability as well as one of accomplishment.[2]

There seemed to be unanimity of opinion among music educators upon one thing; they deplored the lack of uniformity in courses and in course content in the music teachers' program. Yet there were points upon which they themselves could not agree. Some favored integration of music with other subjects; others feared that music skills would suffer through its integration with other courses. Whether or not all agreed upon integration of music and non-music courses, the educators approved integration within the field of music - of sightsinging and form and analysis into the harmony course. Integration seemed to be one of the reasons why liberal arts courses assumed more importance - educators stressed the need of a broad outlook

---

1. Careful Selection of Students, M.S.N.C. Yearbook 1933, p. 178 (Neff, John)
2. McEachern, Survey and Evaluation of School Music Teachers in the U. S. pgs. 44 & 54 - 58 & 117.

for the music teacher, of a good cultural background, as a basis for music interpretation.

There was no universal agreement on the subject of education courses, but the majority seemed to favor the inclusion of general principles rather than specific methods in the teachers' training program. It was generally conceded that the content of the courses could be improved and that time thus saved could be well spent on other subjects. This same criticism was stated in regard to methods courses.

All men placed emphasis upon the need of musicianship courses in the music teachers' program, and, within this field, upon certain subjects that they felt were not receiving enough time and effort, namely, sightsinging, conducting, applied music and ensemble. The importance of counterpoint, composition, and form and analysis as separate subjects was being questioned. Every one seemed agreed, however, on the fact that entrance requirements to the music teachers' training course were not as high as desired. The difference in the instrumental and vocal courses did not, evidently prove great enough to provoke any discussion.

In conclusion, below are presented the suggested programs of the most important music organizations in school music fields, The Music Educators National Conference and

the National Association of Schools of Music, which indicate the general thinking of leading music educators in this period.

Recommendations of The Music Educators National Conference for the training of music teachers:

Entrance Requirements in Music
  Ability to play piano. (at least Grade 2)
  Sightsinging of hymns and folk tunes.
  Ability to sing agreeably.
  Ability to take tonal dictation of moderate difficulty

Degree - Mus. B. or Mus. B. in Education
  (120 semester hours)

Liberal Arts subjects - 30 semester hours.

Professional subjects - 28 semester hours.
  (General education - 10; methods and practice teaching - 18.)

Music - 44 semester hours. (theory - 16; harmony and dictation, chorus, etc. - 12; history and appreciation - 8; orchestration - 2; electives - 4; conducting - 2.)

Applied music - 18 semester hours; (piano - 8; voice - 4; orchestral instruments - 6.)*

Recommendations of the National Association of Schools of Music for the teachers'training program:

Entrance Requirements in Music
  Preliminary knowledge of piano.
  Elementary knowledge of theory.

Degree - Mus. B. - 120 semester hours.

Liberal arts - 18 semester hours (English and speech - 8; electives - 10)

Professional subjects - 26 semester hours (general education - 12; special methods and practice teaching - 14.)

Music - 32 semester hours (Harmony and sight-singing - 18; history and appreciation - 4; conducting - 2; electives - 8.)

Applied music - 30 semester hours
  Voice major - voice - 12; electives - 6; piano - 12.

---

*Butterfield, Music Program for Tennessee High Schools, pgs. 60 - 64.

Instrument major - major instrument - 12;

minor instrument - 18;

Electives - 14 semester hours.*

*Booklet - National Association of Schools of Music, 1939, p. 22.

Findings and Conclusions

Perhaps the most obvious characteristic of the period (1931 - 1941) was the lack of uniformity and standardization among the different schools. This was particularly true in 1931 for such fields as liberal arts, musicianship, applied music, and ensemble (Tables II, p. 18, VI, p. 29, XIV, p. 42, XVI, p. 48). In these subjects the distribution was such that almost as large a percentage of schools offered the smallest number of hours for credit as offered the greatest amount of credit, with many colleges scattered unevenly between these two extremes.

A survey of the same schools over the ten years revealed no general agreement, on the whole, as to the importance of individual subjects, for this indecision was marked by vacillating action, some schools increasing, others decreasing hours for the same subject. Fluctuation was apparent from the fact that often only the smallest number of colleges presented no change in required courses from 1931 to 1941. About as many schools decreased as increased their credit for certain subjects, namely: general education, practice teaching, musicianship, sightsinging, harmony, history and appreciation, orchestration and ensemble. (Tables III, p. 21; V. p. 26; VI. p.29; IX. pg.33; X. p. 35; XI. p. 37; XIII. p.39; XIV. p.42.) These tables

reflected an unsettled situation in the music colleges' curriculum.

It could be possible, of course, that these changes - decreases and increases - were all moving in the direction of standardization, raising and lowering credit requirements to reach a mutually desired number of hours. Yet, looking over the same subjects as those mentioned under 1931, there appeared no great unanimity of accord - although possibly there was less difference than before. There still existed a wide distribution of colleges under each classification of hours for the fields of liberal arts, musicianship, ensemble and applied music; the most progress toward similarity of requirement was made in the last mentioned subject, however. (Tables II. p. 18; VI. p. 29; XVI. p. 48. XIV. p.42).

This lack of standardization is not so surprising in the light of music education and its spirit of experimentation. The field of music education is comparatively recent in its entrance into the public school and has had to adapt itself to new demands made upon it by various factors. No wonder it was still flexible in its teachers' training program for 1941. It is probably true that the state of fluctuation observed over the ten year period pointed to dissatisfaction with the college curriculum.

It is highly possible that the successful appearance of the instrumental teacher caused educators to re-evaluate the courses in the music teachers' program, which, in turn, would create change and exhibit the instability observed previously. The fact that the states took little initiative in their certification laws, in listing required music courses and the time devoted to them,did not encourage standardization. Educators expressed the need for uniformity, not only as to the time allotted to courses, but in the content itself of courses mentioned; however, no organized effort appeared to present any achievement in this direction.

A certain amount of standardization was observed in the subject of education and music history, however, (Tables III. p. 21, and XI. p. 37). Since music educators were inclined to question the value of all the time spent in education courses, it must be assumed that the steady position of this subject in the curriculum was the result of state requirements in this field for all teachers. With music history, the situation was due, perhaps, to an already developed satisfactory course. The subject of applied music and harmony showed a greater tendency toward standardization in 1941 than in 1931, but in reality, had slight pretense to such a claim. (Tables XV. p. 44 and X.

p. 35.) Pressure of music educators' opinion and a feeling of inadequacy by teachers in these fields could be responsible for the direction in which these subjects were moving.

Certain subjects assumed a place of more importance over this ten year period. From a study of the same schools, it was found that conducting credit was decreased by no college but was either increased or at least retained (Table XII. p. 39). A similar survey with regard to applied music revealed the same trend. (Table XIV. p. 42). Comparison of the distribution of college hours in these subjects over the ten years showed an advance in their importance. (Tables XII. p. 39 and XIV. p. 42). Since educators were quite agreed that the music teacher was poorly prepared in these two fields, it is not surprising that more time was devoted to these subjects. The additional credit in harmony was possibly due to its integration with content material from other subjects such as form and analysis, as well as the desire of educators to make better musicians of the prospective music teachers (Table X. p. 35).

One subject was declining in favor over these years - methods (Table IV. p. 23). Two reasons could account for the diminishing emphasis on the methods

courses. Educators were stressing the value of general principles to the disadvantages of specific training techniques. They also were criticizing the content of these courses, so that possibly, the material in them was improved, which necessitated less time in the curriculum. These factors would explain the action of the colleges with regard to methods courses.

The subjects of musicianship, sightsinging, orchestration, general education,and ensemble fluctuated during this period, increasing in some schools and decreasing in others, but, on the whole, the situation and place of these subjects in the curriculum was little changed in 1941 from that in 1931 (Tables VI. p. 29; IX. p. 33; XIII. p. 39; III. p. 21; XVI. p. 48). Other subjects which were fairly stable during these ten years were music history and practice teaching; the steadiness of the first mentioned subject was possibly the result of achieving a satisfactory course in the early years. That of the second subject, probably the result of state certification laws. (Tables V. p.26 and XI. p. 37).

When comparing the courses of the instrumentalist with those of the vocal teacher over this period, it is evident that in 1941 more colleges specialized in the two types of programs, but less distinction between the two courses was made. In the field of liberal arts, edu-

cation, and specific methods, where there was a distinction, more hours were credited to the vocal teacher; (Tables II. p. 18; III. p. 21; IV. p. 23); in the field of musicianship, conducting, orchestration, applied music, and ensemble, the additional hours were in the instrumental courses, (Tables VI. p. 29; XII. p. 38; XIII. p. 39; XIV. p. 42; XVI. p. 48). Colleges could not agree on scheduling credit for practice teaching, history of music, and harmony, for some required more hours for the vocal courses, others,more hours for the instrumental (Tables V. p. 26; XI. p. 37; X. p. 35).

This situation is what might be expected in view of the manner in which professional musicians with little general educational background were introduced into the schools as the first instrumental teachers. With this type of prececessor, it was not surprising that the later instrumental teacher's training emphasized musicianship rather than cultural and educational subjects. In fact, under the 1931 state laws for teachers, where a distinction was made between the instrumental and vocal courses, less educational background was required for the instrumental teacher.

Most schools in 1931 (92%) as in 1941 (92%) had equal requirements for both types of teachers in the course

of music history. Subjects in which appeared more tendency in 1941 to offer equivalent hours for both types of training were conducting ensemble, education, practice teaching and liberal arts subjects (Tables XII, p. 38; XVI. p. 48; III. p. 21; II. p. 18; V. p. 26). On the other hand, subjects in which appeared less tendency on the part of colleges to offer the same hours for the vocal and instrumental programs were methods, harmony, and orchestration (Tables IV. p. 23; X. p. 35; XIII. p. 39).

These facts seem to show that although the instrumental teacher originated in a different background from the vocal, it was seen that their needs were quite similar. The large amount of uniformity in education courses for 1941 was probably the outcome of state requirements in that field, a factor that undoubtedly influenced practice teaching in the same manner. Emphasis upon integration might account for the increase in the instrumentalist's background in academic subjects, this tending to equalize the hours in the vocal and instrumental program. The need of a wide, cultural background was stressed for its importance upon musical interpretation as well as its value in subject correlation in teaching.

Success of the early instrumental teacher, with better musical than educational foundation, may have had its

effect upon the vocal course in the subjects of conducting and ensemble, for there was quite a move in the direction of increasing the requirements for the vocal teacher in these subjects to equal that of the instrumental (Tables XII. p. 38; XVI. p. 48). It must have appeared that the musical needs of the vocal teacher were as great as those of the instrumentalist - certainly this fact cannot be denied. In this connection it is rather surprising that in 1931 and 1941, with or without the inclusion of the subject of orchestral instruments, less than half of the schools specified the same requirements in applied music for both types of teachers, although it must be admitted that the situation was improved somewhat in 1941. (Tables XIV. p. 42 and XV. p. 44). Does not the vocalist have as great a need of performing ability as the instrumentalist?

In some cases, colleges showed more tendency to schedule equivalent credit for the two types of courses in 1931 than in 1941. This was true for the subjects of methods, orchestration, and harmony. (Tables IV. p. 23; XIII. p. 39; X. p. 35). It is possible that the vocalist needs more methods in his course since his problems in the schools are more varied, and it is understandable that an instrumentalist should delve deeper into the field of orchestration than the vocal teacher because of

the very nature of his work. What is more difficult to comprehend is a reason why both teachers should not have the same credit in harmony; however, since the difference over the ten years was so small as to be almost negligible, there was still a large proportion (86%) offering equal harmony credit to both types of teachers.

To summarize, in 1941, requirements for the instrumental and vocal courses were fairly uniform in education and in the history of music; in education, due probably to the effect of state laws; in music history, a possible result of satisfaction with the status quo. A fair amount of uniformity was observed in practice teaching (perhaps due to state laws), conducting, and harmony, the last two to be attributed to the needs of all music teachers as expressed by leading educators. The slight standardization observed in liberal arts (but still an increase over 1931) was probably the result of the interest in integration which highlighted the weaknesses in the instrumental program.

The cry of the educators that music teachers should be performers could account for the increased equalized credit in ensemble for the two types of teachers, but this was still small in 1941 (58% of the schools). It is understandable that the vocalist was allotted more methods,

the instrumentalist more orchestration. What is surprising is the fact that even in 1941 only a small percentage of schools offered an equal amount of applied music to both courses - at the expense of the vocal program. This has been a criticism of music teachers - they couldn't perform creditably. Vocal teachers couldn't sing well - when their singing formed a standard for children's vocal training, when their vocal ability was so necessary in directing assembly singing, in conducting voice classes.

The changes achieved in the instrumental and vocal programs have strengthened the weaknesses in each course - giving more cultural background to the instrmental and more musical training to the vocal teacher, making more alike the type of training both received.

The influence of the music educators was felt through the changes in subject emphasis over the ten year period. The most definite advancement in scheduled credit from 1931 to 1941 appeared in the subjects of conducting, applied music, and to a lesser degree, harmony; all educators expressed the need for more training in these fields. Methods, a subject with which there was general discontent, was declining in the number of hours accredited. The standardization and stabilized position of music history was satisfactory since it evoked little discussion;

this fact is not applicable to the stabilized position of general education, the content and courses of which were assailed by prominent music teachers. State law, consequently, must account for the lack of action in this field.

Other subjects in the program of the two types of specialized training were fluctuating, increasing in some schools, decreasing in others, but evidently no force was strong enough or universal enough to influence all colleges in any one direction. At any rate, the weaknesses in the most noticeable aspects of the music teachers' education, conducting, applied music, and harmony, were being corrected - corrections that in time would necessitate improvement in other subjects, as witnessed in the course of music methods, for the purpose of saving time for all important essentials in the training of music teachers. Since the states took little initiative in music curricula, the problem is one that must be handled through the cooperation of college leaders and music educators. Possibly they can help standardize the basis for granting credit in applied music and ensemble and, by pressure of opinion, continue to improve the weaknesses in the prospective music teachers'program, such as inclusion of more applied music credit for vocal teachers to equal that of instrumental teachers.

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

The purpose of the paper is to discover changes or trends effected in the period from 1931 to 1941, particularly those bearing upon the comparative training of instrumental and vocal music teachers, and to find, if possible, reason for the changes: Was the new type of instrumental teacher responsible for any variations in the traditional music teachers' curriculum; was any interaction apparent of one course upon another? To this end, requests were sent to all forty-eight states for a statement of their certification laws in 1931 and 1941, that the minimum standards of both years could be studied in the light of the problem to be considered. Forty-one states plus the District of Columbia sent replies for the year of 1941, but only seventeen responses were received for the year of 1931.

For material on the actual college training program, one hundred fifty schools were contacted for their 1931 and 1941 catalogues, that a comparison of the curricula in these two years might be made. From these colleges, eighty-five responses were received, but of these, just forty-nine schools in 1931, sixty-six in 1941, sent the full information desired. The material was handled

in the following manner: the number of required hours in each field and subject for each school was noted and classified into groups for each year and then compared. From this appeared the relative emphasis upon certain subjects, and by comparing the relative emphases in the two years, tendencies could be shown. In the same manner the two types of training - instrumental and vocal, were studied. Then, as a further check on the above results, the same school was observed in both years to learn whether or not each subject was being increased or decreased in the number of hours credited.

To explain the findings from the above study, books, music education yearbooks, and magazine articles, written between the years of 1931 and 1941 were carefully read. The information obtained from these combined types of study constituted the thesis.

A study of the minimum standards as set by the states in 1931 showed that only seven of the seventeen states in the survey required a degree for certification, and of these only three listed any music content; if any distinction between the vocal and instrumental courses was made, the vocal teacher was assigned a three year college course; the instrumentalist, about a year of college and a specific ability to play an instrument.

In 1941 thirty-three of the forty-two states (including District of Columbia) required a degree or a state examination; twenty-four accepted only a degree for certification. When a distinction was made between the vocal and instrumental teachers, the degree was required for the vocal, professional experience for the instrumental. Twenty-one states listed suggested music courses, but no agreement as to the relative importance of the various subjects was apparent. Those courses generally suggested were harmony and sightsinging, methods, and applied music, (even division of instrumental and vocal work) and, to a lesser degree, conducting and music history.

A study of the actual practice in the colleges for the years between 1931 and 1941 showed a growth in specialized courses. Fifteen out of forty-nine colleges in 1931 had instrumental and vocal courses; thirty-one out of sixty-six in 1941. These specialized courses generally required more hours for graduation than non-specialized schools. If any distinction was made between the vocal and instrumental courses, usually more hours were specified for the latter. In both years the majority of schools listed one hundred twenty to one hundred thirty hours in the curriculum.

To facilitate study of the curriculum itself, the

material was divided into different classifications; liberal arts, general education (including psychology) specific music methods, practice teaching, applied music, ensemble, and musicianship.

There was seen from the study, a very slight increase in the interest in liberal art subjects during the years 1931 and 1941. In 1931 schools seemed undecided as to the distribution of credit in this field; some gave more to the vocal teacher, others giving an equal amount to both the instrumental and vocal programs; in 1941 the larger number of schools made the same requirement for both types of training. Generally speaking, education courses were specified about equally for the instrumental and vocal teachers in both years. A certain amount of standardization appeared, with a large percentage of schools in 1931 and 1941 requiring 10 to 20 hours. The music methods course was diminishing in importance over this period, and if there was any distinction made, the vocal teacher was credited with more hours in the subject for both years. In practice teaching, on the whole, there was a fair amount of increase in the number of hours credited in 1941 over those listed in 1931, and a large proportion of schools in both years mentioned the same requirement for each of the two specialized courses.

The overall picture of musicianship remained unchanged, although there was a certain amount of fluctuation during the period. More schools offered the same hours to both types of teachers - to a lesser degree in 1941 - but if not, a heavier load was generally included in the instrumental program. Interest in composition was slight over the ten years. No distinction was made in the form and analysis requirement for vocal and instrumental teachers, with little variation in its place in the schedule over the period studied. The little interest shown in counterpoint in 1931 continued to lessen in 1941, when it was sometimes specified for instrumentalists only.

There was little change in the subject of sight-singing as a separate subject at this time, but integration of the material into the harmony course was becoming more widespread. Harmony requirements were increasing slightly, possibly as a result of the integration, and were exacted the same for instrumental and vocal teachers alike. The equal requirement in music history for both types of training showed little variation in 1941 from that of 1931. Conducting was a more important subject in 1941 than previously since many more schools increased their offerings in the subject. While in 1941 more schools devoted a like amount of time to conducting in the curricula of both types of teachers, in 1931 a good proportion gave more conducting to the

instrumentalist. Little change occurred in orchestration in this ten year period, when, generally, most schools specified an equal amount for the vocalist and instrumentalist, although a few colleges did schedule more hours in this subject for the instrumental teacher.

Applied music was increasing in favor and importance in 1941. In both years the instrumental teacher was granted more credit in this field, but this was true to a lesser degree in 1941. There was need for uniformity as to the basis for granting credit in applied music as well as a need for a concerted opinion as to the value of class lessons. The situation in regard to ensemble was about the same in 1941 as before, except that in 1931 a larger number of schools allowed the instrumentalist more credit, while in 1941 more schools made the same requirement for both teachers. Standards for college entrance did not seem too high in either year but in this respect improvement was noted for the year 1941.

Study of reading matter, published during the years 1931 to 1941, disclosed that the music educators were not content with the music teachers' training program. They all deplored the lack of uniformity among college curricula, and then voiced their suggestions for the improvement of the teachers' training. It was generally felt

that the music teacher should have more applied music in college, since all agreed that he should be able to perform creditably in some branch of music. They all sensed the value to the teacher of subjects in the field of musicianship, particularly conducting and sightsinging, but discounted the usefulness of counterpoint and composition to such a course. The consensus of opinion was that too much time was devoted to specific methods, that the content of the courses could be improved to include this material in fewer hours. Most educators seemed to stress the need for a wide cultural background for music teachers, a fact that increased the importance of liberal arts courses in the curriculum. They also lamented the low standards for admission to college music courses, but no constructive plan appeared.

There was not so much agreement on the subject of general education courses. Some stressed their value over specific methods courses and thought them of benefit; others felt that the time spent on them was not warranted by the little value received. It was generally thought that some improvement could be made in these courses. Another subject provoking much discussion was integration. Some music educators saw music becoming subordinate to other subjects through integration; others saw value in correlation of music and non-music subjects. However they

felt on such correlation, most all agreed upon the integration of different music subjects, such as sightsinging with harmony.

Probably the training program for music teachers as suggested by the Music Educators National Conference reflected the ideas of a majority of educators in this period. It offered a curriculum which had one-fourth of the work in professional training (education, etc.), one-fourth in cultural background (liberal arts), and one-half in music. Another organization, the National Association of Schools of Music, consisting of college educators, presented a program for music teachers' training: one-fourth of the work in professional subjects, about one-sixth in liberal arts, and over one-half in music, leaving about one-tenth of the time for electives.

As a result from the above study, certain observations were made. A lack of uniformity among colleges in their curricula was apparent. The fluctuation of a single subject in the same schools over the ten year period, the need for agreement as to the subjects' relative importance as witnessed by the unplanned increasing and decreasing of their hours by the different colleges, the wide distribution of schools over all classifications of numbers of hours studied in each subject, all these factors were evidence of

the lack of standardization. The spirit of experimentation was quite in keeping with the history of music education, and it was possible that the appearance of a new type of teacher - the instrumentalist - caused re-evaluation of the course of study and resultant change.

There was slightly more standardization in 1941 than 1931, and this was most apparent in general education courses, probably the effect of the state laws, and in history of music courses, possibly the consequence of satisfactory hours included originally.

There was an increase in the amount of conducting, applied music and harmony included in the curriculum for the music teacher. The first two subjects became more important because of the agitation and discussion of music educators; harmony was affected not only by discussion of the subject itself, but also by that of integration, which possibly caused to be included within the course, material from other courses. The decline in methods hours in the program over the period was the result partly of the improvement in the content of the courses and partly of the emphasis upon general principles, to the disadvantage of specific methods.

There were more specialized courses in 1941, but

these specialized courses were more alike than they were in 1931. Where there was a distinction, the vocal teacher was given more general education, liberal arts, and methods courses; the instrumental, more musicianship, conducting, orchestration, and applied music. The subjects on which more colleges agreed in giving like credit to both courses from 1931 to 1941 were practice teaching, education (result, possibly, of state laws), history of music, and harmony, the importance of which was emphasized by music educators.

Subjects whose hours were becoming increasingly more alike for the instrumental and vocal teachers were conducting, ensemble, general education, practice teaching, and liberal arts. This was working in the right direction, in strengthening the weakness of the vocal teacher in the field of music, and that of the instrumental teacher in his cultural and educational background. Subjects where more distinction in the instrumental and vocal programs was made in 1941 than in 1931 were methods, orchestration, and harmony, but these changes were small. It is possible that the vocalist needed more methods, the instrumentalist more orchestration, because of the difference in their work; the variation in the harmony requirement was so slight that it indicated very little.

One aspect of the training of vocal and instrumen-

tal teachers was difficult to understand: why, in this period, were not more noticeable advances made to grant equal amounts of applied music to both types of teachers? There was a tendency toward equalizing the credit in the subject in 1941 but it did not seem proportionate to the need, for in 1941 only 37-1/2% of the schools specified the same hours for both teachers. Should not the vocal teacher have as much applied music as the instrumental? It must be admitted, however, that there was a definite increase in applied music generally for all schools from 1931 to 1941.

Although these two types of teachers - instrumental and vocal - had different beginnings, it was gradually seen that they had many common needs. Consequently, the instrumentalists' educational and cultural background was improved, and certain phases in music received more emphasis in the vocal program - diminishing the weaknesses of each type of training.

Since the states took little initiative in the music teachers' training courses, the responsibility for the changes occurring in the period from 1931 to 1941 lay mostly with music educators themselves, who by thoughtful work were seeking to better the curriculum - a situation that appeared to be developing, but very slowly.

APPENDIX

Schools and Colleges used in Survey

Albion College - Albion, Michigan.

Arizona State Teachers College - Tempe, Arizona.

Arthur Jordan Conservatory of Music (Butler University,)Indianapolis, Indiana.

Baldwin-Wallace College - Berea, Ohio.

Bethany College - Lindsborg, Kansas.

Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.

Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

Carnegie Technology, (Institute of) Pittsburg, Pa.

Central College, Fayette, Missouri.

Coker College, Hartsville, South Carolina.

College of Emporia, Emporia, Kansas.

College of Music of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, Colorado.

Conservatory of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri.

Converse College, Spartanberg, South Carolina.

Drake University, DesMoines, Iowa.

Eastman School of Music, Rochester, New York.

East Tennessee State College, Johnson City, Tenn.

Fort Hays State College, Hays, Kansas.

Fresno State College, Fresno, California.
Harden - Simmons University, Abilene, Texas.
H. Sophie Newcomb Memorial College, New Orleans, La.
Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Illinois.
Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.
Indiana University, Wilmington, Indiana.
Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
Juillard School of Music, New York City, New York.
Kansas City - Horner Conservatory, Kansas City, Mo.
Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas.
Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois.
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
MacMurray College for Women, Jacksonville, Illinois.
Mansfield State Teachers College, Mansfield, Pa.
McPhail College of Music, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Miliken Conservatory of Music, Decatur, Illinois.
Murray State Teachers College, Murray, Kentucky.
Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville, Missouri.
Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.
Oberlin Conservatory of Music, Oberlin, Ohio.
Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio.
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.

Potsdam Normal School, Potsdam, New York.

State Teachers College, Indiana, Pennsylvania.

State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minnesota.

State Teachers College of Washington, Pullman, Wash.

St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota.

Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.

Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky.

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, No. Dakota.

University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.

University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

University of Redlands, Redlands, California.

University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

University of Wichita, Wichita, Kansas.

University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming.

Wayne University, Detroit, Michigan.

Western Maryland College, Westminster, Maryland.

Western State College, Gunnison, Colorado

West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Virginia.
Willamette University, Salem, Oregon.
Women's College of University of North Carolina,
  Greenboro, North Carolina.

Schools Sending only Partial Information

Ball State Teachers College, State College, Pa.
Columbia University, (Teachers College) New York
  City, New York.
Fredonia State Normal School, Fredonia, New York.
George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
Peabody Conservatory of Music, Baltimore, Maryland.
Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.
Winona State Teachers College, Winona, Minnesota.

States Used in Survey

Alabama
Arizona
California
Colorado
Delaware
District of Columbia
Florida
Georgia
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
No. Carolina
Ohio
Oklahoma
Oregon
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
So. Dakota
State of Wash.
Texas
Tennessee
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
West Virginia
Wisconsin
Wyoming

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Birge, Edward B. History - of Public School Music in U. S. Oliver Ditson, Phila. 1937.

Booklet National Association of Schools of Music Southwestern College, Memphis, 1939.

Bulletin National Association of Schools of Music Southwestern College, Memphis, 1938

Butterfield, Mondel - A Music Program for Tennessee High Schools, Columbia University, New York, 1943.

Dickey, Frances History of Public School Music. Columbia University, New York, 1913.

Dykema, Peter Music for the Public School Administrator Columbia University, New York City, 1931.

Dykema, Peter Survey of College Entrance Credits and College Courses in Music, Council of Music Supervisors, New York National Bureau for the Advancement of Music, New York City, N. Y.

Glenn, Mabelle & Mursell, James, Psychology of School Music, Silver Burdett Co., New York, 1931.

Kwalwasser, Jacob-Problems in Public School Music, Witmark & Sons, New York 1932.

Lapp, Douglass, Cooley & Prosser, School Music as a Career. Careers published by the Institute for Research, Chicago, 1939.

Monger, Howard Instrumental Music Requirements in Colleges, Univ. of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1935.

McEachern, Edna A Survey and Evaluation of School Music Teachers in the United States, Columbia University, New York, 1937.

Mursell, James Music in the American Schools, Silver-Burdett Company, New York, 1943.

Music Supervisors National Conference, Bulletin #1, Music Education Research Council, Courses for Training of Supervisors of Music, Chicago, 1932 (also Bulletin #16).

Music Supervisors National Conference, Bulletin #13 Subject of Newer Practices and Tendencies in Music Education, Cornell University, Ithaca, 1930. (Also Bulletin #11, 1929).

Music Supervisors National Conference, Yearbook, Issues 1932-1940, Chicago (Music Supervisors National Conference (title) changed to Music Educators National Conference in 1934) Sections on Music Supervision, Teacher's Training, College and University Music. Articles used in thesis cited below:

1932 Yearbook.

Beattie, J. W. Suggestions on the Content and Procedure in Music Education Courses.

Shepherd, A. R. - Music in Universities, Colleges, and Teacher Training Institutions.

1933 Yearbook.

Gildersleeve, Glenn. Producers and Consumers of Music Teachers.

Hosmer, Helen. Value of a Broad Knowledge of Music to the Choral Conductor.

Neff, John. Careful Selection of Students - Essential Part of a Teacher Training Program.

Stringham, Edwin. What Can be Done About It?

1935 Yearbook.

Essentials and Lesser Essentials in my Training - Symposium of younger teachers.

Evanson,Jacob. Educational Requirements.

Haydon, Glen. Aims and Objectives of College and Conservatory Curricula in Music.

Holmes, Ralph. Musical Foundations and Developments,

Stopher, H. W. Adequate Ensemble Practice for College and University Schools of Music,

1937 Yearbook.

Nohavec, Hazel. Education of the Music Teacher

for the Modern School.

Schultz, Ernest, Lower Division Courses for Future Teachers of Music in the Schools.

1938 Yearbook.

Dickey, Frances. Bases for Admission to Teachers' Educations.

1939-1940 Yearbook.

Christy, Van A. Weak Links in the Preparation of Music Teachers.

Doty, E. W. Training of Music Teachers.

Pierce, Ann. Studies in Teachers' Training.

Tilson, Lowell. Can Student Selection be Justified on Basis of Demonstrated Ability?

Wolfe, Irving. Teacher Preparation from the Teachers' Viewpoint.

Normann, Theodore. Instrumental Music in the Public Schools, Oliver Ditson, Philadelphia, 1931.

Norton, Alma. Teaching School Music, C. C. Crawford, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1932.

Patterson, Annie. Professional Music and How to Prepare for It. Wells, Gardner, Darton & Co., London, 1928.

Trotter, T. H. Yorke, Music in Education Incorporated London Academy of Music, London, 1934.

Thompson, Randall. College Music, MacMillan Co., New York 1935.

Magazines

Education Magazine, Palmer Company, Boston, Oct. 1933

Articles used in paper:

Cheyette, Irving. Teaching Instrumental Music in the Public Schools.

Dykema, Peter. The Music Teacher - Trainer or Educator.

Miller, C. H. Vocational Significance of Music in the Public Schools.

Morgen, Russell. Music as Education.

Spaulding, Charles. Organizing the Junior High School Band.

Weinburg, Nathan. Music Pedagogy of the Future.

The Music Supervisors Journal, (Became Music Educators Journal in 1934 (fall issue). Music Supervisors National Conference, Chicago (all issues from Oct. 1932 to April 1945.)

Articles used in paper:

Birge, Edwin. One Hundred Years of School Music, September - 1935.

Birge, Edwin. Public School Music, 1838 - 1938. February - 1938.

Burns, S. T. School Music in Louisiana, Mar. 1938.

Cheyette, Irving. Trends in Music Teacher Education, October - November 1940.

Conklin, F. Colwell. A Balanced School Music Program, March, 1938.

David, Lytton. Whither Music Education? Sept. 1939.

Earhart, Will. History of Public School Music, May, 1938.

Farnol, Henry. Teacher Training, Then What? March, 1940.

Flueckiger, Samuel L. Some Trends in Music Education, March, 1939.

Gehrkens, Karl. Graduate Study in Music Education, March, 1940.

Gehrkens, Karl. Lessons of the Century, Sept. 1936.

Green, Elizabeth. Trends in Instrumental Music Teaching, September, 1937.

Hendsley, Mark. The Instrumental Music Teacher, Dec. 1937.

Jones, Archie. Changing Status of the Music Supervisor, February, 1936.

Jones, Archie. Curricular Trends in Music Education December, 1936.

King, Chauncy. College Courses in Music Education, October and December, 1933.

McConathy, Osbourne. Some Problems in School Music, March, 1937.

McConathy, Osbourne. The Next Twenty-Five Years, October, 1932.

Nohavec, Hazel. A Three Dimensional Program for the Post-war Period, May - June, 1944.

Otterstein, Adolph. Problems of Music Teaching in the School, March, 1934.

Pitts, Lilla Belle. Music Education, Isolated and Integrated, September, 1937.

Righter, Charles. Wisconsin Makes a Survey, October, 1937.

Seashore, Carl. Advanced Degrees in Music, April, 1945.

Silvey, Clel T. On Cataloging Music Courses, October, 1939.

Van Bodgraven, Paul. Looking Forward in Music Education, February - March, 1942.

School Review, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, April 1936.

Article:

Raising the Level of the Education of Teachers.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02556 9924

B. U. Libraries
Not to be
taken from this room